



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,892	08/18/2003	Raymond V. Calvesio	RA-5621	3356
27516	7590	01/29/2010		
UNISYS CORPORATION			EXAMINER	
Unisys Way			PLUCINSKI, JAMISUE A	
Mail Station E8-114				
Blue Bell, PA 19424			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/29/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
2  
3

---

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5 AND INTERFERENCES  
6  
7

---

8 *Ex parte* RAYMOND V. CALVESIO, MICHAEL J. GLAVAN,  
9 VIRGIL V. POLINSKE, and JOHN A. OLSON  
10

---

11 Appeal 2009-003660  
12 Application 10/642,892  
13 Technology Center 3600  
14  
15

---

16  
17 Decided: January 29, 2010  
18  
19

---

20  
21 *Before* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, and BIBHU  
22 R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
23  
24 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.  
25  
26

27  
DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection of claims 1-32. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

Appellants invented systems and methods for processing passengers that are intending to cross international borders (Spec. 2:2-4).

Claim 1 under appeal is further illustrative of the claimed invention as follows:

1. A method of using a data processing system for processing travelers crossing international borders, comprising:

a) prior to the time of travel, allowing an authorized enrollment representative to employ the data processing system to enroll a traveler to utilize an automated check-in process after the authorized enrollment representative verifies that the traveler is eligible to make an international border crossing; and

b) at the time of travel, utilizing the automated check-in process to enable crossing of the international border, which may then be completed without aid of human intervention.

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Sehr	US 6,085,976	Jul. 11, 2000
------	--------------	---------------

The Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sehr.

We AFFIRM.

ISSUES

Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred in asserting that a passport agency issuing a passport to a traveler in Sehr corresponds to prior to time of travel, an authorized enrollment representative verifies that the

1 traveler is eligible to make an international border crossing, as recited in  
2 independent claim 1?

3 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred in asserting that a  
4 passport agency certifying and authorizing downloading of passport  
5 information to a traveler's computerized card of Sehr corresponds to prior to  
6 time of travel, an authorized enrollment representative enrolls a traveler to  
7 utilize an automated check-in process, as recited in independent claim 1?

8 Did the Appellants show the Examiner erred in asserting that the  
9 automated check-in and boarding pass issuance processes of Sehr  
10 correspond to utilizing an automated check-in process to enable crossing of  
11 an international border without aid of human intervention, as recited in  
12 independent claim 1?

13  
14 FINDINGS OF FACT

15 *Specification*

16 Appellants invented systems and methods for processing passengers  
17 that are intending to cross international borders (Spec. 2:2-4).

18  
19 *Sehr*

20 Sehr discloses a travel system and methods which utilize  
21 computerized cards for the automated use of a traveler's permit and of other  
22 travel-related documents, purchase of goods and services, and the rendering  
23 of other traveling services (col. 2, ll. 63-67).

24 The automated travel system and methods include storing  
25 transportation rights, service entitlements, and cardholder considerations into  
26 the passenger card; presenting the card for passage through passenger

1 stations and admission to transportation means; and communicating card  
2 data and related information between and among the system entities (col. 3,  
3 ll. 57-67).

4 A major feature of the system is that these remote distributed  
5 databases, including the passenger card, always contain the same set of data  
6 that is required to qualify a passenger for travel or service eligibility (col. 5,  
7 ll. 29-32).

8 The cardholder's identity can be verified at the passenger station by a  
9 carrier/travel representative, including via selected information stored in the  
10 passenger card. For example, when presented for international travel, the  
11 card can provide the cardholder's certified picture that was previously stored  
12 in the card or imprinted onto the card package. The station's control module  
13 can capture the physical appearance of the passenger presenting the card and  
14 compare it with the picture stored in the card *per se*. If there is a match, the  
15 passenger's identity is established; otherwise, a message conveyed that the  
16 comparison was not successful. In addition, authorized personnel can also  
17 verify the picture imprinted onto the card, as well as the passenger's  
18 demographics information stored in the card; a successful verification  
19 indicates that cardholders are who they say they are. The passenger's  
20 identity can also be verified via security data stored in the card and  
21 information provided by the cardholder (col. 23, ll. 21-38).

22 Also stored in the card can be the card templates that are an electronic  
23 representation of the documents pertaining to the cardholder, such as the  
24 driver's license, car registration slip, insurance papers, and passport. These  
25 documents can be requested from the appropriate authorities, such as DMV

1 office, insurance company and passport agency, and certified and  
2 downloaded into the card after proper identification is provided by the  
3 cardholder (col. 32, ll. 11-18).

4 As the day of departure arrives, the cardholder drives to the airport to  
5 catch the reserved flight (col. 33, ll. 49-50).

6 Upon arrival at the check-in counter, the passenger hands the card to  
7 the airline representative who couples the card to the system for verification  
8 purposes (col. 34, ll. 12-14).

9 Because this is an international travel, the passenger's passport will be  
10 verified as well. The passport will be retrieved from the passenger card and  
11 viewed on the control module's display screen. The representative can  
12 verify the displayed information as is, or might request additional  
13 information to further verify the lawful bearer; for example, the signature of  
14 the passenger to be entered via a signature pad (col. 34, ll. 23-30).

15 After successful verification, the system compiles and loads the  
16 boarding pass into the card, as well as cancels the ticket portion, which is  
17 related to the flight segment(s) the passenger has been qualified for (col. 34,  
18 ll. 34-37).

19 The above process of checking-in, tagging the luggage, and issuing a  
20 boarding pass by an airline representative can also be accomplished  
21 automatically via the card's built-in computerized means, while coupling the  
22 card to the passenger station-like apparatus and communicating with the  
23 airliner's system database (col. 35, ll. 57-62).

## 24 PRINCIPLES OF LAW

### 25 *Claim Construction*

1 While the specification can be examined for proper context of a claim  
2 term, limitations from the specification will not be imported into the claims.  
3 *CollegeNet, Inc. v. ApplyYourself, Inc.*, 418 F.3d 1225, 1231 (Fed. Cir.  
4 2005).

5 During examination of a patent application, a pending claim is given  
6 the broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification and  
7 should be read in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one  
8 of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d  
9 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

## 11 ANALYSIS

### 12 *Verification of Eligibility to Cross International Border*

13 We are not persuaded of error on the part of the Examiner by  
14 Appellants' argument that a passport agency issuing a passport to a traveler  
15 in Sehr does not correspond to prior to time of travel, an authorized  
16 enrollment representative verifies that the traveler is eligible to make an  
17 international border crossing, as recited in independent claim 1 (App. Br. 14-  
18 15). The Examiner asserts that passport agencies correspond to the recited  
19 authorized enrollment representatives (Ex. Ans. 5-6). Appellants argue that  
20 passport agencies do not perform any verification process that may  
21 determine whether the traveler is eligible to make any particular  
22 international border crossing because, for example, visas necessary to cross  
23 a particular international border are not taken into account. However, this  
24 "particular" aspect is not set forth in the claims. See *CollegeNet, Inc.*, 418  
25 F.3d at 1231. Under a broadest reasonable interpretation of "eligible," a  
26 finding in Sehr that a traveler is generally eligible to make international

1 border crossings sufficiently satisfies this aspect of independent claim 1.  
2 *See In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d at 1364. Verification of  
3 general eligibility only requires that an entity has decided that a traveler  
4 could cross an unspecified international border at a future unspecified date  
5 and time, even if the traveler has no particular itinerary and may need to  
6 fulfill additional specific visa requirements for certain countries. To that  
7 end, a passport agency's issuance of a passport to a traveler, as set forth in  
8 Sehr, is verification that the traveler is generally eligible to cross  
9 international borders (col. 5, ll. 29-32; col. 32, ll. 11-18).

10 Moreover, we agree with the Examiner that some countries only  
11 require a passport for entry. Accordingly, the issuance of a passport to a  
12 traveler is verification that the traveler is eligible to cross those particular  
13 international borders.

14  
15 *Automated Check-In Process*

16 We are not persuaded of error on the part of the Examiner by  
17 Appellants' argument that a passport agency certifying and authorizing  
18 downloading of passport information to a traveler's computerized card of  
19 Sehr does not correspond to prior to time of travel, an authorized enrollment  
20 representative enrolls a traveler to utilize an automated check-in process, as  
21 recited in independent claim 1 (App. Br. 17-19). Appellants assert that a  
22 passport official does not enroll a traveler to use any particular check-in  
23 process for a particular itinerary. However, such an aspect is also not set  
24 forth in the claims. *See CollegeNet, Inc.*, 418 F.3d at 1231. A broadest  
25 reasonable interpretation of "enrolls a traveler to utilize an automated check-  
26 in process" only requires that a traveler can use any automated check-in



1 process for an unspecified itinerary. *See In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*,  
2 367 F.3d at 1364. Sehr discloses that a passport agency certifies and  
3 authorizes downloading of passport information to a traveler's computerized  
4 card (col. 32, ll. 11-18). Sehr also discloses that this computerized card can  
5 be used in automated check-in processes (col. 2, ll. 63-67; col. 3, ll. 57-67;  
6 col. 35, ll. 57-62). Accordingly, Sehr meets the aforementioned claim  
7 aspects.

8  
9 *Without Human Intervention*

10 We are not persuaded of error on the part of the Examiner by  
11 Appellants' argument that the automated check-in and boarding pass  
12 issuance processes of Sehr does not correspond to utilizing an automated-  
13 check-in process to enable crossing of an international border without aid of  
14 human intervention, as recited in independent claim 1 (App. Br. 19-25).  
15 Appellants assert that the automation of processes in column 35, lines 57-62  
16 of Sehr only apply to "checking-in, tagging the luggage, and issuing a  
17 boarding pass," and that verification of a traveler's eligibility to cross  
18 international borders is not included. However, independent claim 1 recites  
19 an "automated check-in process," which is one of the items clearly listed by  
20 the aforementioned portion of Sehr. Additionally, absent additional  
21 guidance in the claims as to what exactly enables a traveler to cross an  
22 international border, both automated check-in and automated issuance of a  
23 boarding pass are processes that facilitate enabling a traveler to cross an  
24 international border. *See In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d at  
25 1364.

Moreover, verifying a traveler's eligibility to cross international borders is a part of at least the check-in and boarding pass issuing processes set forth in Sehr (col. 33, ll. 49-50; col. 34, ll. 12-14; col. 34, ll. 23-30; col. 34, ll. 34-37). While Appellants may be referring to a more specific definition of verification, such aspects are not set forth in the claims. *See CollegeNet, Inc.*, 418 F.3d at 1231.

Furthermore, Sehr discloses automated identity verification when "[t]he station's control module . . . capture[s] the physical appearance of the passenger presenting the card and compare[s] it with the picture stored in the card per se" (col. 23, ll. 21-38).

#### *Claims 2-32*

Appellants assert that independent claims 23 and 31 include aspects similar to independent claim 1, and thus are allowable for the same reasons (App. Br. 26-27). As we sustain the rejection of independent claim 1, we also sustain the rejections of independent claims 23 and 31.

Appellants assert that dependent claims 2-22, 24-30 and 32 are allowable due to their dependence from respective allowable independent claims 1, 23, and 31 (App. Br. 27). As we sustain the rejections of independent claims 1, 23, and 31, we also sustain the rejections of dependent claims 2-22, 24-30, and 32.

#### CONCLUSION OF LAW

On the record before us, Appellants have not shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-32.

DECISION

The decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1-32 is affirmed.  
No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with  
this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) (2007).

AFFIRMED

hh

UNISYS CORPORATION  
Unisys Way  
Mail Station E8-114  
Blue Bell, PA 19424